

## **REMARKS**

This application has been reviewed in light of the ADVISORY ACTION mailed January 17, 2007. Reconsideration of this application in view of the below remarks is respectfully requested. Claims 3, 5, 8 – 10, 16 – 18, 20 – 21, 25 and 28 – 31 are currently elected for continued prosecution with Claims 3, 8, 16, 18, 25, 28 and 29 being in independent form. By the present amendment, Claims 3, 8, 16, 18, 25, 28 and 29 have been amended, and Claims 30 and 31 have been canceled. No new subject matter has been introduced into the disclosure by way of the present amendment.

Claims 3, 8, 16, 18, 25, 28 and 29 have been amended to recite the limitations of Claims 30 and 31; namely, that the at least one network identifier in the second list is an identifier of a network that is not to be used.

Bridges discloses that “the entries in the PSL/IRDB should be prioritized, and the mobile station can truncate the PSL/IRDB once the maximum storage capacity is reached.” (See: Col. 11, lines 36 – 38). However, Bridges fails to disclose or suggest that the at least one network identifier in the second list is an identifier of a network that is not to be used.

Moreover, the mobile station disclosed in Bridges et al. compares the received single identity against the plurality of identities maintained on the mobile station. Consequently, the mobile station of Bridges et al. does not compare a received list containing a plurality of network identifiers against a second list, which includes at least one network identifier, and is stored on the user equipment to identify at least one network for handover, as recited in Applicant’s Claim 28, and similarly recited in Claims 3, 8, 16, 18, 25 and 29.

Contrary to the assertion in the present Advisory Action, the Bridges et al. passages cited, namely col. 12, lines 66 – 67 and col. 13, 34 – 38, do not disclose Applicant’s claimed first list

including a plurality of network identifiers. The cited passages disclose that in situations where multiple service providers exist in a given area, the PSL/IRDB stored on a mobile station may comprise a table of multiple SIDs and/or SOC's and their corresponding frequency bands. (See: Bridges et al.: col. 12, lines 35 – 67). Thus, this list is equivalent to Applicant's second list that is stored in the mobile station, because no disclosure is provided in Bridges et al. that the table is a received list.

Instead, Bridges discloses that each service provider sends its own network identifier. Therefore, the user equipment in Bridges receives each network identifier individually, not as a list, as recited in Applicant's independent claims.

None of the other references cited in the previous Office Action overcome the deficiencies identified above in Bridges. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 3, 5, 8 – 10, 16 – 18, 20 – 21, 25, 28 and 29 are allowable over the cited prior art.

## CONCLUSIONS

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that all claims presently pending in the application, namely, Claims 3, 5, 8 – 10, 16 – 18, 20 – 21, 25, 28 and 29 are believed to be in condition for allowance and patentably distinguishable over the art of record.

If the Examiner should have any questions concerning this communication or feels that an interview would be helpful, the Examiner is requested to call Applicant's undersigned attorney at the number indicated below.

Respectfully submitted,



Paul J. Esatto, Jr.

Registration No. 30,749

SCULLY, SCOTT, MURPHY & PRESSER, P.C.  
400 Garden City Plaza - Suite 300  
Garden City, New York 11530  
(516) 742-4343

PJE:DAT:tam